



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to prove that they can. Will the "Inquirer," or any one else, say that the Popes have never departed from God's law, or refused to walk in his judgments? If any one will venture to say this, we will answer him by printing some extracts from Cardinal Baronius, the most approved historian of the Church of Rome.

Our "Inquirer" relies very much on the prophecies of Isaiah. We will not follow him into all his passages. We ask for proof that these prophecies were intended to apply to the church in her present state. We know that the Church of Christ is to exist hereafter in a glorified and triumphant state. We know that there are many prophecies which describe her as she shall be in that state. But the "Inquirer" seems to forget this entirely; and every prophecy which he finds about her he applies to the church in its present state, without considering to what state it was intended to apply.

He quotes Isaiah liv. He does not quote verse 7—"For a small moment have I forsaken thee, but with great mercies will I gather thee." With God 1,000 years are but as a day, and it is no more, in comparison of the eternal destiny of his church. Will "Inquirer" say that the church cannot err, during the time, long or short, of which this verse speaks? He quotes verse 12—"I will lay thy stones in order, and found thee in sapphires, and I will put the jasper stone for thy munitions." We ask him to compare this with Apocalypse, or Revelation, ch. xxi., v. 19, &c., and consider to what state of the church this prophecy is to be applied.

Again, he quotes Isaiah, ch. lx., v. 18, as describing the present state of the Church of Rome—"Iniquity shall be no more heard in thy land, waste and destruction in thy borders; and salvation shall occupy thy walls, and praise thy gates."

Is Rome without iniquity? Have her own historians never said, that many successive Popes were monsters of iniquity, who filled her city and her land with their crimes? and was this the time of which the prophet said—"Iniquity shall be no more heard in thy land?" Or was there no waste or destruction in her borders when, but two years ago, Rome was besieged and taken by a French army?

Does not "An Inquirer" see that if these prophecies were indeed spoken of the Church of Rome, in her present state, they prove that she is *without sin*, as well as without error? If these prophecies prove that the Pope cannot err, they prove also that he cannot sin. We believe all Roman Catholics will admit that he can sin, like other men; and in admitting this they admit that these prophecies are not spoken of him.

Again, he applies verse 20 to the Roman Church in her present state—"Thy sun shall go down no more, and thy moon shall not be diminished, because the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended."

The whole of this verse evidently applies to one and the same time, whenever that time shall be. Do the last words refer to the present or a future time?

We answer this from two encyclical letters, one published by Pope Gregory XVI., in 1832—"We come now to another most abundant source of evils, with which we grieve to see the church afflicted;" the other, that of Pope Pius IX., dated 21st November, 1851, announcing the new Jubilee—"In the midst of the incessant and painful solicitudes with which the calamity of the times overwhelms us, . . . it is for us no slight subject of sorrow to behold what a sad and lamentable spectacle is presented by our holy religion, and civil society, in those calamitous times." Does the Pope grieve thus over the church in that time of which the prophet said, "the days of thy mourning shall be ended?"

We think not; we think that these are the days of mourning, and so thought Pope Gregory XVI., and we see from the above that Pope Pius IX. thinks so too. And so we take it for certain that these prophecies relate to a future, and not to the present state of the church. And comparing this verse of Isaiah with Apocalypse, or Revelation, ch. xxi., v. 23, we find that this prophecy is to be accomplished in the New Jerusalem; and we find, from v. 4, that the time shall be when "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and death shall be no more, nor mourning, nor crying, nor sorrow shall be any more, for the former things are passed away."

Sad would it be, indeed, for the Church of God, if she could hope for no better fulfilment of these glorious prophecies than what can be found in the present condition of the Church of Rome.

The "Inquirer" seems to apply to the priests of the Roman Church Jeremiah xxxiii. 18—"To kill victims all days." Will he tell us what victims they kill? If they kill none, what claim have they to this prophecy more than we?

He asks why we will refuse to admit the Pope to be Christ's vicar on earth, when Jeremiah, in the place referred to above, says, that David shall never be without "a son (a vicar or vicegerent) to reign in his throne." We answer, simply because St. Luke tells us ch. i. v. 32, that Christ himself is that son, who shall reign in the throne of David for ever. And, therefore, we cannot consent to the "Inquirer" putting in "a vicar or vicegerent" into that prophecy, and into that throne, out of his own head.

He reminds us of Daniel's prophecy, that the kingdom of Christ shall last for ever, and asks—"How, unless having a visible head?" We cannot see that it is beyond the power of Christ to govern his spiritual kingdom without the help of a man to take his place. Christ tells us that his kingdom is not of this world. Why, then, must it be governed like the kingdoms of this world? Christ also tells us, "The kingdom of God is within you." Christ has also promised that he himself will dwell in us. We think that Christ dwelling within us is the only proper head of his kingdom, which is within us. How can any man be the head of that kingdom?

Lastly, he quotes Isaiah ii. 3, saying that the Lord shall judge among the nations. That seems to us a good reason for looking to the judgment of the Lord, and seeking for it in his Word. Can he show us where it is said that the Pope shall judge amongst the nations?

We return to the instance we have selected. Did the Apostles say, that "whole Christ" was contained in the bread by itself, and also in the wine by itself? We do not ask for proof that the Apostles wrote this. We are content to take the proof that they said it. Who will give us such proof? And are we expected to believe without proof?

This cannot be proved to us by taking prophecies that describe the church when the days of her mourning shall be ended, and applying them to the days when the Popes themselves are mourning over the afflictions of the church. Let us have proof of the fact that the Apostles said this, and we will believe it. Will "An Inquirer" believe it, when he can find no proof of it at all?

We hope our correspondent will receive and consider what we have written as emanating from the same friendly feeling which he expresses towards us at the close of his letter. Would that a like spirit guided all controversy, "with all humility and mildness, with patience, supporting one another in charity, careful to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."—Ephesians iv., 2 and 3, Douay Bible. "We are all brethren: why should we strive?"—St. Augustine, Op. Tom. iv., p. 102.

ANSWER TO NOTES AND QUERIES.

The following appears in the September number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN:—

"NOTES AND QUERIES."

"Can any one explain why, in the Roman Catholic creed, the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, the word 'AMEN' is put in the middle and not at the end? Or is there any other instance in the Catholic Church, since it began, of this word *Amen* being put in the middle of either a profession of faith or a prayer, and not at the end of it?"

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN."

"A Friend to Truth" wishes to know if he be correct in saying that the Church of Rome does not allow the sacrament of Extreme Unction to a criminal that is to be executed?"

To the first I beg to observe, that in the Roman Ritual, the profession of Catholic Faith, somewhat erroneously called the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, commences with the NICENE CREED, and at the conclusion thereof (the Nicene Creed) the word "AMEN" is put after the last sentence—"the life of the world to come. Amen"—as it is to be found in the Book of Common Prayer, and, of course, whenever the Nicene Creed is recited. The remainder is a profession of faith more explanatory and in detail, in which the word *Amen* does not occur at all—beginning, middle, or end.

"A Friend to Truth" is informed, that had he consulted the general catechisms for the use of schools, he would have learned that the sacrament of Extreme Unction is administered only to such as are in danger of death by sickness; consequently, that neither a criminal about to be executed, nor a soldier going to battle is a fit recipient of this sacrament.

One good turn deserves another; will you, therefore, do me a favour in kind, by answering a note and query of my own?

In two late numbers of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN I perceive you have been ingeniously taking a correspondent of yours to task, touching the Roman Catholic interpretation of Scripture. This induces me to inquire, among the different interpretations of the Bible put forward by Protestantism, since the Reformation, which is the true one, or where I can find the sense in which the Protestant Church has held and does hold the Holy Scriptures?

Believing that such an interpretation is somewhat inconsistent with private judgment, of which you are so great an advocate, I should not have asked the question at all, were it not that I have it upon the authority of Mr. Napier, in the House of Commons, May 21, 1852, that "the Church of England has now become an active and living interpreter of God's Word."

All very good; but, where is its true sense of the

Holy Scriptures to be found. Has it ever been published?

A FRIEND TO INQUIRY, BECAUSE IT ELICITS TRUTH.

Our correspondent says—"The remainder (of Pope Pius' Creed) is a profession of faith, more explanatory and in detail."

Of what is it explanatory? Of what does it give the details? Is it of the Nicene Creed? If not, what does it explain? This question will probably be treated more at large in future numbers.

To the last question we reply—The Church of England and the Church of Rome do not make the same claim as interpreters of Holy Writ. The Church of England claims to be authorized, as an interpreter, to assist men to understand, by aiding the exercise of their own reason. In questions of faith she interprets by the Catholic Creeds, which are the genuine testimonies and tradition of the Church of all ages. She admits no other articles of faith but these. She admits no one to her communion who does not receive these articles. She condemns all interpretations of Scripture contrary to these. In other matters relating to religion, she interprets Scripture by her catechism, her articles, her formularies, the teaching of her authorized ministers. She claims authority thus to interpret, and she claims an attentive hearing, in a tractable spirit; but she does not want any man to submit to these interpretations further than she convinces his understanding.

But the Church of Rome claims a greater authority, of interpreting Scripture, at least in some things. She claims a power of interpreting some passages of Scripture so as to make other articles of faith which are not in the ancient Catholic Creeds: she demands us to believe these interpretations, whether the reasons which she gives convince our understandings or not; and she tells us that we shall be damned to all eternity, as heretics, if we do not believe them. In answer to this, we ask her—What these interpretations are, and where they are to be found? and she cannot or will not tell us. We think this a fair question to put to her, and we beg for an answer.

The Church of England does not claim to do this, or profess to have done it; and we, therefore, think it unfair and absurd to ask her to show where she has done it.

THE POWER OF THE PRIEST.

MR. EDITOR—I live in the west of Mayo, where they say the priest used to be able to turn boys into foxes and hares; but I'm not such a fool as to believe he can do so now; and indeed I myself was by when one of the turn-coats dared him to turn him into a goat, and his reverence rode off in a passion, and never made even an offer at it. The jumper grinned when he saw him sticking the spurs into his old horse, though it was no laughing matter in my mind, in these parts, to grin at a priest for not being able to work a miracle off-hand that a way; and many's the stout boy that not long ago would have run far enough before facing a priest, and I'm feared the jumper will hear of it yet. But what I want to know from you, Mister Editor, is, what you think is the power of the priest, and whether his curse really does people any harm, and particularly whether my reading your paper against his orders is any harm. I used to get it myself at the office, when it first came down here; but all of a sudden it was stopped, though I've often thought that it was the priest that stopped it, and not the friend (whoever he was, good luck to him) that found me out to be fond of reading on both sides and sent it to me, I am sure for nothing but friendship. My reason for thinking that it was the priest that stopped it is, that the day after I inquired for it, and was told there was none that turn for me by the postmaster, who is a cousin of Father —. Peggy Malowny, who is the servant girl that attends to the childer at the house, and is a cousin of my own, showed me a torn cover with my name on it, which she found at the back of the grate in the little parlour behind the shop, where Father — and two friars had been sitting together, examining the directions of the letters, and maybe taking a peep at the inside of an odd one or two, where they thought it good for the souls of the boys that hadn't gone to confession lately. Now, Mr. Editor, maybe they wrote "refused" on my paper, and that without the postmistress telling any lie, I'll be bound the friars told her; for sure enough she refused to give me the paper, which, no doubt, is all as one as my refusing to take it. Peggy tells me, that in making up the bag betimes, she sees papers sent back to Mr. Curry, in Sackville-street, with "refused" written on them; and maybe it is only themselves that refuse to give them to the lawful owner, for whom it was sent. I suppose you guess that the post-master and mistress goes to mass regular, and the priest and friars are most particular in their attention to them onst a month, at any rate; maybe, however, it doesn't do any great good to them after all, to be playing false in that way; for, sure, doesn't it make the boys more greedy to get it wherever they can get a lone, or a sight of it unknownst to the priest? And I can tell you, Mr. Editor, I never rested till I made out a friend who shows it to me regular, "be-

hind the bush," as they say; and maybe "stolen milk" is the sweetest, and there is no use calling milk *poison*, when all the world understands the differ. And I can tell you I know plenty of lads who was taught to read and write in the national school, that reads the LAYMAN as well as me, and don't we discuss it together; and think it is no wonder that the priests won't answer all the Greek and the Latin, and other languages too, which puzzle us entirely to make out what they mane. By the same token I don't think our priest, or his cojutor either, knows as much Greek as would fit on a sixpence, and its much aisier, no doubt, to *curse* the boys as read your paper (and a civil spoken paper it is, in my humble judgment), than to prove purgatory out of the old Fathers of the three centuries, as you begged them to do, twist over, if not three times itself. But that brings me back, and I beg pardon from wandhering away from what I want to know. Do you really think the priest's curse does people any harm, or is it just like the ould threat of the foxes, and hares, and goats, that they used to be threatening the people with when they found the lash of the riding-whip was not enough to regulate their minds, and bring the boys to *raison*, as Father O'Sullivan used to say in ould times, when he'd ride in among them at the fairs and other gatherings where there was a bit of a row? Jem O'Driscoll says he doesn't believe the priest's curse signifies a button, unless the boys are themselves willing to carry it out again one another, which I'm hoping they're beginning not to like as well as they used, when party fights was so common among them, and the bit of land was worth fighting for, which, werasthrue, it has never been since the potatoes went to the bad; and, Mr. Editor, I am myself very nearly of Jem O'Driscoll's mind in the matter, only just I'm doubtful whether it wasn't the priest's cursing the people that made God curse the potatoes, which its as plain as my face (and sure enough I'm as ugly as I need be at any rate, since I got the bating at Castlebar three years ago last August), its as plain as my face that God did *curse* the potatoes for some raisin best known to himself, and maybe it might be to punish the priests for keeping back the Bible from them as wanted it badly, and is now gone to Americy, to be free to do what they like, and read what they like. I don't myself think the boys is the worse of the cursing; but my notion is, that the priests is a dale worse, though they're no doubt doing their best to conceal it, and keep a good coat on their backs for decency and a good appearance. I beg your pardon humbly, Mr. Editor, for troubling you with this; but when you printed Pat Murray's letter about Kingstown Harbour, which pleased all the boys here very much, specially as they'd often paid themselves for their father's souls, (heaven be their bed!) I thought maybe you'd like to know about the post-office and the friars in the back parlour.—Your humble servant to command,

TIMOTHY M'D.

P.S.—Don't forget to answer me whether you really think Jem Driscoll is right or not about the cursing.

We beg T. M'D.—to borrow from his friend the first number of our paper, in which he will find our ideas in full on the subject of priestly cursing, both as to its sinfulness and inefficacy; and though we cannot insure them against violence from the priest's followers, we can assure T. M'D. and his friends that the priest's *curse* will do them no other harm, and they need not fear God's curse, if they do nothing to break the law of God, as laid down in the Holy Scriptures. He will also find, in the same number, an accurate report of a trial at the Antrim assizes, on the 20th of March, 1846, before the late eminent Judge Burton, where a miller, named Charles M'Loughlin, recovered £70 damages, and above £100 costs, against a Roman Catholic priest, for cursing him from the altar. We shall, at an early opportunity, call the attention of our readers to another reported law case, where £125 damages was recovered against a Roman Catholic bishop, at the Lifford assizes, for excommunicating from the altar one Philip Boyle, which, we are assured, has put a stop to such proceedings in that part of the country ever since.

If any of our readers, who shall be cursed by their priests for reading the LAYMAN, would have the courage to try the effect of the *miller's remedy*, we will venture to foretell, the priests will leave them alone for the rest of their lives. We feel obliged to Mr. M'D. for his suggestions as to the post-office; and having received several similar hints from other parts of the country, we have lodged a complaint before the General Post-office authorities on the subject, and have been assured of their active co-operation in detecting and punishing the offenders under the Post office Offences' Act (1 Vict., c. 36), which subjects to *fine* and *imprisonment*, with or without *hard labour* and *solitary confinement*, any one who shall, for any purpose, *destroy*, *detain*, or *delay* any newspaper, or other printed paper whatever, sent by the post, or who shall aid, counsel, solicit, or endeavour to procure any other person to do so.

It is high time that *back parlour* proceedings should be put a stop to, though we have reason to believe that Roman Catholic postmasters, in general, know their duty better than to allow any one to induce them to lend

themselves to such illegal and arbitrary interference with her Majesty's post-office establishment.

INDULGENCES.

We had hoped that Dr. Keane, or some other learned Roman Catholic divine, would have responded to our invitation to furnish our readers with an authoritative explanation, from "a living, speaking tribunal," of the points necessary to establish that the blessings said to flow from indulgences are not chimerical, but founded in reality; but regret they have not done so.

We have not space, in our present number, for inserting the results of our own reading and thinking upon the subject, but have not forgotten our promise to consider, at the earliest opportunity in our power, the force of the best reasons we have been able to find in Roman Catholic controversialists in support of the doctrine and practice in question.

FARM OPERATIONS FOR NOVEMBER.

Wheat.—Good and seasonable weather for sowing wheat has much influence on the crop, and, with the best farmers, from the latter end of September and during October is considered the best seed season, particularly in light, rich soils; but hitherto the necessity of permitting the potato crop full and sufficient time to come to maturity, has been the cause of wheat not being generally sown in Ireland until this month, and, therefore, farmers considered themselves particularly fortunate in getting in the wheat crop any time during the month of November. We would, however, much rather see the wheat sowing concluded within October; the ground is in much better order, not so much saturated with wet, and much less seed will be required; it will tiller more evenly, and be more early in for the sickle—advantages of the utmost importance to the farmer, besides leaving the present month so much more at liberty to the different other farming operations necessary to the advancement of the spring's work. We would, therefore, impress upon our friends the necessity of losing no time in finishing wheat sowing, where that operation has not been performed, ample directions for which have been given in the preceding month.

Winter Vetches may still be sown, provided the soil be not very wet; they are best sown in beds from 6 to 8 feet wide, and a little manure will be necessary; about 4 bushels of seed will sow an Irish acre; 3 or 4 stones of rye may be sown with it, or the same quantity of the Don or winter oats.

Rye, Bere, or Winter Barley may also be sown any time this month, either for a soiling crop, usually called stolen crops, or to stand for seed; from 16 to 20 stones will sow an Irish acre, according as the land is poor or rich.

Beans and Peas.—The Mazagan or Russian bean and gray or hog peas may still be sown any time during this month. For directions see last month's operations.

Parsnips and Early Cabbages.—No time should be lost in finishing the sowing of parsnips, to come in early next July, and transplanting early cabbages, where those necessary operations have not been completed last month.

Stall-feeding.—If the cattle intended for fattening were not put up for this purpose last month, no further time should be lost in doing so; the loss in condition consequent on a fortnight, or even a week's delay, will throw the cattle back a month or six weeks in coming to maturity, and will be severely felt by the feeder, in not having the command of the market at the proper time. The cattle, to be profitable in stall-feeding, should be put up in good, warm, and thriving condition, which will not be the case if left out any longer this cold, stormy weather; they will lose more flesh in a night than can be put on in a week. When first put in, they should be sparingly fed on the white or inferior class of turnips or cabbages, keeping the better, or more keeping sorts—hybrids, Aberdeens, Swedes, and mangels—for the last, in the order above named, increasing the quantity as they get accustomed to the food. In feeding, the best rule is to feed three times a day—at 8 in the morning, 12 at noon, and 5 in the afternoon, giving each beast as much roots as it can cleanly consume. The troughs should then be cleaned out of all unconsumed food, and 3 or 4 lbs. of sweet hay given each, when they should be left at rest and undisturbed till the hour comes for the next feed. The unconsumed food, whether roots or hay, should be given to the store or young cattle, which will greedily eat it up, and nothing be lost. As to the quantity necessary, a beast weighing between 6 and 7 cwt., when finished, will consume, on an average, from the time of putting up until finished, about 1½ cwt. of roots daily, and at the commencement about ¼ cwt. of hay; but as it progresses to maturity, the quantity of hay consumed will be less and less, till in the end it will not amount to over 10 or 12 lbs.; but they will consume the usual quantity of roots till they finally leave the stalls fattened. Cattle thus fed, on roots and hay alone, will be, according to the condition they are put up, finished from the latter end of February to the middle of March; but if they be allowed a little bruised oats, barley, linseed-meal, or oil-cake, the period of fattening will be much shortened.

Sheep may also be housed and fed on roots and hay, and will pay well for their keep, both in flesh and wool; besides, quantities of the richest manures will be made. Breeding ewes and stores should be allowed a little hay and salt, and lambs should get an allowance of turnips and hay.

Milk Cows should now be housed at night, and a few hours in the yards, or a dry paddock, should be all the liberty they should be allowed. If let out in the fields they only poach the land, which is very injurious, if tender, and the manure dropt is lost. Their food should be cooked, consisting of cabbages, turnips, mangels, parsnips, carrots, chopped hay or straw, and the tailings of wheat, oats, or barley.

Stores should be kept close in the house, if there be room, or in good, well-sheltered yards, with open sheds. Remember, dry lodging and generous keep are necessary to insure and develop good form, which will, in the end, command the greatest returns.

Pigs for fattening should now have abundance of cooked food. We take it that, for some time to come, pigs will be the best paying stock—much better than either beef or mutton—and their increase should be particularly encouraged. Turnips, mangels, carrots, parsnips, bean and pea meal, &c., to which may be added some chandlers greaves, will pay better in feeding this stock than in any other way they can be disposed of; they should be kept perfectly dry, comfortable, and clean, and, as a rule with every animal to be fattened, the troughs, &c., should be carefully cleaned out immediately after the animals have satisfied their appetites.

Roots.—By the end of the month, Aberdeen and Swede turnips, mangels, parsnips, and carrots will be sufficiently matured, and should be carefully taken up and stored, as directed last month.

Potatoes should now be planted, to come into early use. We have nothing to add to last month's directions; but that, as a question has arisen upon the propriety of planting them in lazy-beds or drills, we would recommend both combined; the lazy-beds will undoubtedly give the driest winter lodging to this now more than ever valuable esculent; and we would recommend the beds to be formed from four to six feet wide. Form shallow drills across the beds, 18 inches asunder; drop the potato sets, of which the small-sized whole ones are best, in these drills, twelve inches set from set, covered with a little earth; then place some manure over them, so as that the manure and potato sets may not come into actual contact, and cover them well up out of the furrow, still preserving the raised drill shape, which should be pulled down a little with a rake early in the spring, before the shoots begin to protrude; or to keep over the manuring till spring. A great deal of the desired success depends on the state of the weather at planting, which should be dry.

Grass and Meadow Lands.—Continue to manure grass and meadow lands with either composts, previously prepared, farm-yard manure, bones, marl, or gravel.

Odds and Ends.—Thrashing should go on unceasingly, in order to have fresh straw for the cattle, which will do much better on that which is fresh and sweet than on that which is stale and musty. Admit the water to the irrigated or watered meadows, which should be constantly watched, so that the water flows constantly, freely, and evenly over the surface, without stagnation on any portion, and see that the discharging drains are unobstructed. Draining and subsoiling should be particularly attended to when the weather is open, as it is upon the proper execution of all the details respecting this modern improvement that good farming depends; much money is uselessly—nay, viciously, thrown away on these works, for want of the necessary and strict supervision. Keep the plough constantly at work in favourable weather. **Grass land** and old lea cannot be broken up too soon, in order to secure as much as possible of the ameliorating influence of the winter's alternate frosts and thaws, and the rotting and closing of the sods, and heavy clay lands should be ploughed up now with a full and deep furrow, for the same reason, more particularly as frost prevents cohesion in such lands, and heat promotes it. **Coppices** should be cleared, and timber felled, and planting proceeded with. This is also the proper time to pull down old, useless, broken fences; mix them with lime, and convert them into rich heaps of compost; form new fences, and repair old ones. When not ploughing, keep the plough at the cart gathering manure, road-scrappings, and old lands, loamy sand, or bog-stuff, for composts; turn old compost-heaps; quarry, and draw home on the kiln, limestone; also turf, and, when to be had at a reasonable distance, culm, to have at hand for burning the lime as wanted. Repair gates and road-ways; thatch and otherwise repair the roofs of out-offices, and lay up harrows, scufflers, horse-hoes, and such implements as may not be wanting till next season, under cover from the weather, first cleaning and putting them in a proper state of repair.

Dean Swift says, that "he never knew any man rise to eminence who lay in bed of a morning;" and Doctor Franklin, in his peculiar manner, says, "that he who rises late may trot all day, but never overtakes his business."